REMARKS

Claims 25-30 are currently pending in this application. Applicants thank the Examiner for the further attention given to this application.

§103 REJECTION

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanojia et al (US 2004/0181593) in view of Perlman et al. (U.S. 6,023,585). Claims 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanojia et al (US 2004/0181593) in view of Perlman et al. (U.S. 6,023,585) and further in view of Hubbard (U.S. 2005/0149532). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In the present invention, a system and method is provided for automatically detecting the attachment of a peripheral device to a host system and configuring the host system for communication with the peripheral device. The host system then installs and loads a device driver for the peripheral device if the driver is locally available. If the device driver is not locally available, the host system establishes a connection with a server system containing a database with the required device driver. Once the device driver has been installed, display information about the device driver is delivered to the host system. (See Abstract)

The Kanojia application is directed towards a communication and management system that dynamically targets network devices for content deployment as well as users of the network devices for promotions. Specifically, profiles of users are created when the network devices register with the system server. The profiles are continually updated with information provided the activity of the user and event logs that are periodically uploaded from each device. (See Abstract)

The Office Action alleges that the Kanojia application teaches all the steps of claim 25 with the exception of the step "querying the hardware device for device information". Specifically, the Office Action alleges that the Kanojia application teaches the following steps of independent claim 25: detecting the attachment of a hardware device to a host system (paragraphs 186-187); obtaining information about the devices (paragraph 187); establishing a connection with a remote server (paragraphs 101-103); information about the device is forwarded to the server system host (paragraphs 104 and 188); and the host system displays the device information (paragraphs 72, 74, 76 and 121). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Although the Kanojia application discloses installing a peripheral device on a network device, intercepting a plug and play string from the peripheral device when it is attached, sending the string to the system manager, comparing the string to strings of supported operating systems and supporting peripheral devices for which drivers are available and installing the driver (See paragraphs 188-191), it fails to disclose the additional steps of independent claim 25 as alleged in the Office Action. The Office Action refers to paragraphs 100-103 for the step of establishing a connection of a remote server, however, paragraphs 100-103 describe generating a user profile for a network device and is not a step in the dynamic installation of a device driver described in paragraphs 188-191. Additionally, the Office Action refers to paragraphs 72, 74, 76 and 121 for the step of delivering to the host system display information based on the information forwarded to the server, however, paragraphs 72, 74, 76 and 121 describe the display of promotions and monitoring user activities and events and is not a step in the dynamic installation of a device driver described in paragraphs 188-191. Furthermore, although the Kanojia application indicates a peripheral event, which includes connecting a peripheral device to a network device, is a user activity, this is not delivering display information to the host system based on information forwarded to the server as indicated in independent claim 25. Merely identifying unrelated steps of different methods from the same reference does not teach the method of the present invention as there is no teaching or motivation to combine the unrelated steps. The Perlman patent nor the Hubbard application make up for the deficiencies of the Kanojia application.

Therefore, Applicants' invention, as claimed in independent claim 25 is different than the Kanojia application, the Perlman patent and the Hubbard application in that neither reference, either alone or in combination, disclose the steps of establishing a connection of a remote server and delivering to the host system display information based on the information forwarded to the server. As claims 26-30 depend from claim 25, claims 26-30 are also different than the Kanojia application, the Perlman patent and the Hubbard application.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of independent claim 25 and claims 26-30 which depend therefrom. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's representative might expedite prosecution of the application, he is cordially invited to call at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/8/05

By: Heidi Eisenhut
Heidi L. Eisenhut
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 46812

Klein O'Neill and Singh, LLP
2 Park Plaza, Suite 510
Irvine, CA 92614
Telephone: (949) 955-1920
Facsimile: (949) 955-1921

Docket No.: M9192US-DIV